PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION Best Availate Cop see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/IB2004/003583 01.11.2004 04.11.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A63B23/12 Applicant CORNACCHIARI, Renato 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion ☐ Box No. II Priority ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date,

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

whichever expires later.

Authorized Officer

၍)

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Jekabsons, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-6096



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/003583

| _ | Box N | o. I Basis of the opinion |
|----|------------------------|--|
| 1. | With re | egard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. |
| | la | ns opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)). |
| 2. | | egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of: |
| | a. type | of material: |
| | | a sequence listing |
| | | a sequence listing table(s) related to the sequence listing nat of material: in written format in computer readable form of filing/furnishing: contained in the international application as filed. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. |
| | b. format of material: | |
| | | in written format |
| | | in computer readable form |
| | c. time | of filing/furnishing: |
| | | contained in the international application as filed. |
| | | filed together with the international application in computer readable form. |
| | | furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search. |
| 3. | ha Co | addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional upies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished. |
| 4. | Additio | anal comments: |

Best Available Copy

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1,2,5-9

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

3-5

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

Claims

No:

1-9

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

sest Available Copy

1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1: US 5 429 140 A (BURDEA ET AL) 4 July 1995 (1995-07-04)

D2: US 5 791 351 A (CURCHOD ET AL) 11 August 1998 (1998-08-11)

D3: WO 01/08755 A (SMITH & NEPHEW PLC; GRANVILLE, NICHOLAS,

WILLIAM; POUNDER, NEILL, MALC) 8 February 2001 (2001-02-08)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a system for performing induced limb movements having a central processing unit (14), a peripheral unit (30) that is adapted to be used by a patient in order to reproduce a rehabilitation path displayed by the processing means (50), the peripheral unit (30) being provided with position sensors (12) that are adapted to transmit position signals to the processing unit (14) in order to reconstruct the path traced by the patient on the processing unit (14).

3 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-9

Dependent claims 2-9 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT), see documents D1 - D3 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report. The features introduced by dependent claims 3, 4 and 5 cannot be regarded as inventive, since the use of such means are well known to the person skilled in the art and moreover, these features do not involve any unexpected or surprising effect.